1 Nancy B. Macy nbbm@cruzio.com 2 15485 Bear Creek Rd. FILED Boulder Creek, CA, 95006 Tel: 831-338-6578 Home JAN 27 2022 Tel: 831-345-1555 Cell 4 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT Pro Se Claimant, 5 NORTH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 7 8 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CASE NO. CR 14-0175 WHA 9 Plaintiff. 10 MOTION TO PRESENT ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF PG&E's 11 VS. POTENTIAL CULPABILITY FOR THE INITIATION OF THE DIXIE FIRE PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC 12 COMPANY. Judge: Hon. William Alsup 13 Defendant, 14 15 Amici respectfully requests the Court's consideration that the following "working theory" of the potential cause of the Dixie Fire prepared by The Utility Wildfire Prevention Task 16 Force be placed on record: 17 Exhibit A notes that the Line Amperage Readings for Line C stopped at 6:43 AM, while the Line Amperage Readings for Lines B & C continued until approximately 6:09 PM and 18 6:55 PM, respectively. This was over one hour after the Troubleman observed two fuses open and then opened the third fuse. 19 Exhibit B presents a declaration from the Senior Manager of the Distribution Planning 20 Group at Pacific Gas and Electric (name redacted) who states that Fuse 17733 is identified in the Company's Electrical Distribution GIS Database as a 10 Amp Power 21 Fuse with a PT63 Polymer cutout. However he notes in paragraph 7 of Exhibit B that "The fuses in the photo appear to me to be S&C SMU-20 power fuses". 22 Exhibit C, presents a declaration by a PG&E Senior Consulting Electrical Engineer that 23 indicates that the actual type of fuse in use was an S&C SMU-20 Power Fuse which was the subject of a Utility Bulletin in January, of 2020 (approximately 18 months prior to The 24 25

25